REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 are rejected. Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 17-19, and 20 are objected to. Portions of the specification and the title are also objected to. Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 13, 17, and 20 have been amended.

A substitute specification, marked-up and clean version is being submitted with this response.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 11-16, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller, U.S. Patent No. 6,636,959 (hereinafter "Keller"). Claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of "Register Renaming and Dynamic Speculation: an Alternative Approach," by Mayan Moudgill and Keshav Pingali (hereinafter "Moudgill").

Objections to Claims, the Specification, and the Drawings

Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 13, 17, and 20 have been amended in response to the objections to the claims made by the Examiner. Applicants note that no mention of a "dynamic cache line size" is made in claim 20, as objected to by the Examiner.

As to the objections to the specification, applicants could not find the misspelling listed in paragraph 5 of the current office action. In the copy kept by the applicants, the word "cache", appearing as the last word of line 15 of page 6, was spelled correctly. If the last word of line 15 of page 6 is misspelled in the Examiner's copy, the applicants would like the spelling corrected. The word "each" is also present as the second word of line 15 of page 16, in which the "e" may

have been easily mistaken for a "c" as written in Times New Roman font. The use of the word "each" is intentional in this instance and should not be changed.

Applicants further disagree with Examiner's objection to the use of the phrase "sources or designations" as listed in paragraph 6 of the current office action. The Examiner objects to this as being inconsistent with the previous use of the phrase "sources and designations". The complete phrase, as used in line 17 of page 10, is "**BRANCH** uses no sources or designations". This phrase is correct when used in the negative to indicate that **BRANCH** does not use sources and does not use destinations. Therefore, applicants contend that no amendment to this phrase in the specification is necessary.

A substitute specification is being submitted to correct the misspelling of the word "superscalar". However, Applicants have not provided a Summary of the Invention section, since it is not required. 37 C.F.R. §1.73 states:

> A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, should precede the detailed description. Such summary should, <u>when set forth</u>, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed. (Emphasis added by Applicants.)

Therefore, Applicants believe this objection to be overcome and respectfully request the Examiner withdraw this specific objection.

Finally, the title has been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestion.

The claims have been amended to remove a trace cache line initializer per the Examiner's objection. Prior art has not been added to the Figure 1 as it is not considered prior art. Figure 1 is described in the detailed description and not in the background. While various processes described in Figure 1 may be described as prior art, the overall figure is not.

Claim Rejeetions Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 11-16, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller. Keller discloses a line predictor to cache alignment information for instructions (See Abstract).

Applicants contend that Keller fails to teach or suggest determining a set of rename resources needed for the trace cache line on a per-packet basis, as recited in claims 1, 11 and 21. Applicants further contend that Keller fails to teach or suggest comparing the set of rename resources needed for the provisional trace cache line to a rename capacity, as recited in claims 1 and 21. The Examiner implies these teachings from the same section of Keller. Keller states:

> Finally, the line is terminated if the instructions within the line update a predefined maximum number of destination registers. This termination condition is set such that the maximum number of register renames that map unit 30 may assign during a clock cycle is not exceeded.

(Keller, Col. 23, Lines 22-27).

In other words, Keller terminates a line if a predefined maximum is reached. The maximum may have nothing to do with the resource capacity. The method by which the predefined maximum is reached is not discussed. A counter could be set to terminate the line once a pre-set number is reached. Determining a set of rename resources needed for the trace cache line on a per-packet basis and comparing the set of rename resources needed for the provisional trace cache line to a rename capacity are not disclosed.

Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 21 and by their dependency claims 2-4, 8-10, 12-16, 20, and 22 , are not anticipated by Keller.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of Moudgill. Moudgill discloses a mechanism implementing register renaming, dynamic speculation, and precise interrupts (See Abstract).

Neither Keller, Moudgill, nor any combination of the two teach or suggest determining a set of rename resources needed for the trace cache line on a per-packet basis and comparing the set of rename resources needed for the provisional trace cache line to a rename capacity, as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 22, and by their dependency claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23.

Therefore, claims 5-7, 17-19, and 23, are not obvious under Keller in view of Moudgill.

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: March 11, 2004

By: Stephen T. Neal

Stephen T. Neal
(Reg. No. 47,815)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501

7

#7
3-23-04
OW

RECEIVED
MAR 1 9 2004
Technology Center 2100

APPLICATION FOR U.S. LETTERS PATENT

TITLE:

~~INSTRUCTION PACKETIZATION~~
~~BASED ON RENAME CAPACITY~~ FILING A TRACE CACHE BASED ON RENAME RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

INVENTORS:

NICHOLAS G. SAMRA
BRADLEY G. BURGESS

Do Not Enter
SG

PREPARED BY:

KENYON & KENYON
333 W. SAN CARLOS STREET
SUITE 600
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 975-7500

Docket No. 2207/10612
Substitute Specification Marked-Up

~~INSTRUCTION PACKETIZATION BASED ON RENAME CAPACITY~~
FILING A TRACE CACHE BASED ON RENAME RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Field of the Invention

The present invention relates to computer architecture. More particularly, the present invention relates to increasing the number of instructions that may be processed by examining the utilization of renaming resources on a per-packet basis.

Background of the Invention

~~Superscaler~~Superscalar microprocessors process multiple instructions simultaneously. For a given clock speed, higher instruction throughput will generally be somewhat correlated to the superscale degree, or the number of instructions that can be processed simultaneously, which is commonly known as the "width" of the processor. With everything else being equal, microprocessor architectures providing a higher width provide higher performance.

A difficulty with using the single metric, width, is that it may vary different processing stages. One point typically used to measure width is at the boundary between in-order (un-renamed) and out-of-order (renamed) instructions, which is usually at the rename stage of the processor pipeline.

One way to increase the width of the in-order and out-of-order instruction boundary is to increase the size of the rename unit. This option, however, requires incurring additional hardware costs, allocating a greater chip area for renaming, etc.

Instead, it would be desirable to increase the number of instructions that may be processed at the rename stage without changing the design or size of the rename unit.

Those of ordinary skill in the art are generally familiar with the techniques and reasons for executing some instructions out-of-order, and with the use of rename units in ~~superscaler~~superscalar microprocessors. This general familiarity with rename units will be assumed by the present disclosure. While the present invention is likely to be used in conjunction with rename units, the present invention is not intended to be limited to use with any particular design, or size, rename unit.

As will be explained more fully below, prior art microprocessors typically take the size of the rename unit as a design constraint, and load instructions into a trace cache line with a size that will always be completely utilized. It would be desirable to take advantage of the characteristics of the mix of actual instructions, and when feasible to load more instructions into the trace cache line than would be attempted by prior art designs. Such an approach would allow a greater width of instructions to flow through the rename stage, in many instances, than would be possible if the trace cache line size is limited to the worst case situation for a particular rename unit.

Brief Description of the Drawings

Figure 1 is a block diagram illustrating the flow of instructions through a rename unit using a trace cache line.

Figure 2 illustrates the packetization of a stream of instructions into a trace cache line in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention.

Figure 3 is a block diagram illustrating the flow of instructions through a rename unit using a trace cache line in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention.

Detailed Description

The present invention examines a string of instructions to determine the actual system resources required by the string, and loads the instructions into a trace cache line based on the resource requirements. Embodiments of the present invention may allow use of larger trace cache line sizes than might be otherwise used with a given rename unit. Instead of sizing the trace cache line so that it will always be fully loaded, embodiments of the present invention use instruction packetization to allow greater use of rename unit capacity than without such packetization.

Rename units are commonly used in ~~superscaler~~<u>superscalar</u> microprocessor architectures to rearrange the processing of individual instructions in order to achieve increased instruction-level parallelism. The use of rename units is known to those or ordinary skill in the art. The rename unit performs essentially three functions. First, reading and writing to a register alias table (RAT), which maps logical registers to physical registers. Second, the allocation of additional registers to sequences of instructions. Third, the rename unit processes the logical inter-instruction dependencies, such as when the result of one instruction is needed as input by another instruction. For the purpose of this present disclosure, a particular rename unit can be thought of as having a given capacity, where capacity consists of the number of sources (or reads) and the number of destinations (or writes) that the rename unit is capable of processing in a single step. For example, one rename unit may have the capacity for processing eight sources and four destinations while another has the capacity for processing four sources and four destinations. Of course, all else being equal, a larger capacity rename unit is

better than a smaller one. But all else is typically not equal, and designers must limit the rapidly increasing complexity, and cost, of higher rename capacity. Similarly, the ratio of sources and destinations is typically the result of design decisions that attempt to carefully balance various costs and benefits. For purposes of the present invention, a particular rename unit's capacity, in terms of the maximum number of source and destination registers, is given. The present invention takes this rename capacity, whatever it might be, and uses an instruction packetization technique to more fully utilize that capacity.

Figure 1 is a block diagram illustrating a sequence of un-renamed instructions 2 interacting with a rename unit 4 to create a sequence of renamed instructions 6. In this example un-renamed instructions 2 are stored in a trace cache line of size 4. That is, four instructions are stored in each sequence of instructions. The prior art approach to the processes shown in **Figure 1** is to size instruction sequences 2 and 6, and trace caches, so that each is full, and rename unit 4 is always capable of processing these full trace cache lines. For the example in **Figure 1**, a sequence of four un-renamed instructions 2 are processed in to a sequence of four renamed instructions 6 by rename unit 4, which has a capacity of eight source and four destinations.

The above sizes and capacity for trace lines 2 and 6, and rename unit 4 are based on a worst case scenario of each instruction having two independent sources and one independent destination. However, not every instruction actually conforms to the worst case, and sequences of instructions often share source and/or destination registers.

Embodiments of the present invention exploit these properties to increase the maximum trace cache line size for a given rename unit.

Typical assembly language categories of instructions include arithmetic, or logical, operations, such as **ADD r2, r3, r4** and **MUL r2, r3, r4**, date transfer operations, such as **LOAD r2, [r3]**, and central operations such as **BRANCH**, and perhaps others. Most instruction sequences will contain a mix of instructions from different categories. One consequence of a mix of instructions is that not every instruction uses the same number of operands. In the above examples, registers **r3** and **r4** were the sources for instructions **ADD** and **MUL**, with register **r2** the resulting destination, while the **BRANCH** instruction did not use any source or destination. In this admittedly limited set of instructions, a rename capacity of two sources and one destination per instructions would be sufficient for any instruction, although that capacity might not be fully utilized for a particular instruction sequence.

At a more general level, the format of an instruction may be given by:

Instruction Type Dest_1 . . . Dest_n Source1 . . . Source_m

where Instruction Type specifies the particular instruction, or Opcode, and Dest_n and Source_m represent the possible destinations, or other instruction parameters. The worst case, in terms of the rename unit capacity needed for each of these generalized instructions could be **m** sources and **n** destinations. At the other extreme, the instruction might not require any sources and/or destinations. Therefore, a fixed size trace cache line

size of **x** instructions could require a rename unit with a capacity of anywhere from zero to **xm** sources and **xn** destinations. Using an instruction set with a limited number of operands, such as $\mathbf{m}_{max}=\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{max}=\mathbf{1}$, limits but does not eliminate, the variation in the rename unit capacity required for a given fixed size trace cache line size. Similarly, the use of very small trace cache lines limits the variation.

Rather than designing a microprocessor architecture to minimize the variation in the required rename capacity, there are benefits in allowing both instruction sets with a wide variation in the allowed number of operands and large trace cache line sizes. Allowing complex instruction formats permits, for example, the "packing" of several related operations into a single word. As word sizes increase, along with bus capacity, it may be advantageous to pack multiple, relatively simple, instructions into a single instruction that has many operands.

Permitting large trace cache lines is desirable in a ~~superscaler~~superscalar microprocessor, as is evident from the use of the trace cache line size as a measure of the width of the microprocessor.

The examples given in this present disclosure are based on an instruction set architecture with a maximum of two sources and one destination. These limits are used in the examples so that embodiments of the present invention can be clearly conveyed, and the present invention is not intended to be restricted to use with any system with any such limits on the instruction set architecture.

Prior art microprocessors often use the capacity of the rename unit to define the size of the trace cache line size. This design approach ensures that every instruction in

the trace cache can be renamed in a single rename cycle, but may under-utilize the capacity of the rename unit in some instances. The present invention, instead, allows for a larger number of instructions in the trace cache line when, because of the nature of the particular set of instructions, there is capacity within the rename unit to process all the instructions within a given cycle. Embodiments of the present invention allow use finite size trace cache lines, but there may be instances where the trace cache line contains only the number of instructions within the capacity of the rename unit, and with some capacity unused. That is, increasing the maximum trace cache line size and filling the trace cache line with instructions based on the capacity of the rename unit, the present invention may better utilize the capacity of the rename unit, and increase the width of the processor, without incurring the costs and complexity of a larger rename unit.

Rename unit 4 in **Figure 1** has the capacity of renaming instructions with up to eight sources and four destinations. Prior art microprocessors would often use the worst case situation of two sources and one destination per instruction to set the number of un-renamed instructions 2, and renamed instructions 6, in the trace cache to four. With such a design, rename unit 4 is always able to process all the instructions in a single cycle. However, such prior art designs do not examine the actual mix of instructions being renamed and may miss the opportunity to fully utilize the capacity of rename unit 4.

Figure 2 illustrates how an embodiment of the present invention uses "packetization" of instructions to achieve a greater width using rename unit 4, with its capacity of eight sources and four destinations, by more closely examining the actual instructions going into the trace cache line. Instruction stream 8 contains seventeen

instructions, labeled "A" through "Q", that will be placed in trace cache lines 10, 12 and 14, and eventually executed by the microprocessor. A trace cache line maximum size of eight instructions is used in **Figure 2** for trace cache lines 10, 12 and 14. This eight-instruction cache line size is double the size as was used in **Figure 1**.

The packetization technique of the present invention examines each instruction in stream and may exploit up to three potential avenues for loading more instructions into a trace cache line than allowed by the worst case for rename unit 4. First, not every instruction will impose the worst case combination of sources and destinations on rename unit 4, which is two sources and one destination here. The first instruction, **ADD r2, r3, r4**, uses two sources and one destination, **STORE [r4], r5**, uses two sources and no destinations, and **BRANCH** uses no sources or designations.

Second, not all destinations need to exist outside of the packet of instructions within a single trace cache line. For example, if a packet contains the instruction **ADD r3, r4, r5** followed by **SUB r3, r3, r6**, the **ADD** instruction destination, **r3**, is only needed the subsequent **SUB** instruction, and does not need to be written into the RAT.

Third, multiple instructions within a single trace cache line may access the same source register for data. When this occurs, only one read at the RAT is needed to generate the rename for each of several sources in the packet.

In **Figure 2**, the first eight instruction, A through H, require a total of five sources **(r2, r3, r4, r6, and r7)** and three destinations, **(r2, r3, and r5)**. Note that register **r5** is produced by instruction D and is then used by instructions E, F, and G. From the frame

of reference for the entire packetized trace cache line 10, register **r5** is not a source, although it is a destination.

Trace cache line 10 is thus able to hold eight instructions and it has not used all the capacity of rename unit A. For instruction stream 8, a trace cache line size larger than eight could be used without overloading rename unit 4, however a design decision was to limit the trace cache line sizes to eight. Other embodiments of the present invention may use limitations on trace cache line sizes other than eight.

Trace cache line 12 begins with instruction I and contains five instructions. This trace cache line uses four destination registers **(r3, r4, r2, and r6)** and reaches the maximum capacity of rename unit 4 before entirely filling trace cache line 12. Note, however, that trace cache line 12 with five instructions, exceeds those of prior art trace cache lines 2 and 6 shown in **Figure 1**, although it is not full.

The remaining instructions, in instruction stream 8, N through Q, are placed in trace cache line 14. Line 14 then has three destinations and may be able to accommodate additional instructions.

Figure 3 is a block diagram of an embodiment of the present invention somewhat similar to **Figure 1**. Packetization logic 20 is shown logically coupled to un-renamed instructions 16 to evaluate the sources and destination of the entire packet prior to submission to rename unit 4. The placement of packetization logic 20 "downstream" from un-renamed instructions 16 may be reversed in other embodiments of the present invention where the packetization logic is implemented by parsing a large sequence of un-renamed instructions, using packetization, to create a trace cache line of un-renamed

instructions. The present invention is not intended to be limited to any particular order of placing un-renamed instructions 16 into a trace cache line. Unlike **Figure 1**, the trace caches for un-renamed instruction 18 now exceeds the size of what a worst case sequence of instructions could impose on rename unit 4. However, with the above packetization technique, the trace cache lines may not be full during end rename cycle.

The present invention might be thought of as using the concept of packet granularity for placing instruction in a trace line, similar to the way the rename unit operates at a packet granularity level. Thus, the size of the trace cache lines, the input and output to the rename unit, is more closely correlated to how a rename unit operates than prior art designs, which used trace cache line sizes matched to a worst case processing situation. In this way, redundant sources with a packet need only RAT access for the packet, instead of one RAT access per instruction. Similarly, some destination RAT accesses can be eliminated. Eliminating unnecessary RAT access has the added benefit of reducing the power requirements for the microprocessor as well as increasing the width.

The present invention may be implemented in hardware, software, firmware, as well as in programmable gate array devices, ASICs and other similar devices.

While embodiments and applications of this invention have been shown and described, it would be apparent to those skilled in the art, after a review of this disclosure, that many more modifications than mentioned above are possible without departing from the inventive concepts herein. The invention, therefore, is not to be restricted except in the spirit of the appended claims.

What is claimed is:

1. A method for processing instructions in a ~~superscaler~~ superscalar microprocessor, comprising:

selecting an initial sequence of instructions for inclusion in a trace cache line;

determining a set of rename resources needed for said trace cache line on a per-packet basis;

adding one or more provisional instructions to said trace cache line to create a provisional trace cache line;

repeating said determining step for said provisional trace cache line;

comparing said set of rename resources needed for said provisional trace cache line to a rename capacity; and

accepting said one or more provisional instructions for inclusion in said trace line and repeating said adding step, or rejecting said one or more provisional instructions, based on said comparing step.

2. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed and said rename capacity include a source parameter.

3. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed and said rename capacity include a destination parameter.

4. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed and said rename capacity include a line size parameter.

5. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

determining a set of rename resources needed on a per-packet basis excludes destinations subsequently over-written within the packet from said set of rename resources needed.

6. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

determining a set of rename resources needed on a per-packet basis excludes redundant sources within the packet from said set of rename resources needed.

7. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

determining a set of rename resources needed on a per-packet basis excludes sources created within said trace cache line.

8. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

selecting said initial sequence of instructions uses a worst case assumption of said set of rename resources needed.

9. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

selecting said initial sequence of instructions includes tabulating a maximum rename resource cumulative total based on a plurality of instruction types.

10. A method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

selecting a number of provisional instructions is performed based on a difference between said set of rename resources needed and said rename capacity.

11. An apparatus for processing instructions in a ~~superscale~~ superscalar microprocessor, comprising:

an instruction stream with a plurality of instructions;

a trace cache line for receiving said instructions from said instructions stream;

a packetized instruction resource calculator for determining a set of rename resources needed for said instructions in said trace cache line;

an instruction adder, responsive to said packetized instruction resource calculator, for adding one or more instructions to said trace cache line from said instruction stream while said set of rename resources needed is less than a rename resource capacity.

12. An apparatus in accordance with claim 11, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed includes a source parameter.

13. An apparatus in accordance with claim 11, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed included a destination parameter.

14. An apparatus in accordance with claim 11, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed includes a line size parameter.

15. An apparatus in accordance with claim 14, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed includes a source parameter.

16. An apparatus in accordance with claim 15, wherein:

said set of rename resources needed includes a destination parameter.

17. An apparatus in accordance with claim 11, wherein:

said packetized instruction resource calculator excludes destinations subsequently over-written within said trace cache line from said set of resources needed.

18. An apparatus in accordance with claim 17, wherein:

said packetized instruction resource calculator excludes redundant sources with said trace cache line from said set of resources needed.

19. An apparatus in accordance with claim 18, wherein:

said packetized instruction resource calculator excludes sources created within said trace cache line.

20. An apparatus in accordance with claim 11, further comprising:

a trace cache line initializer for initially loading said trace cache lien with an initial number of instructions.

21. An apparatus in accordance with claim 20, wherein:

said initial number of instructions is calculated as a fraction of said rename resource capacity.

22. A method of creating cache lines of instructions in a computer system, comprising:

determining the number of instructions in the cache lines using a packetization of instructions technique and a dynamic cache line size;

matching said dynamic cache line size to a rename unit capacity.

23. A method in accordance with claim 22, wherein:

matching said dynamic cache line size includes eliminating redundant register references within the cache lines.

Abstract

An apparatus and method for loading instructions into a trace cache line using instruction packetization to increase the throughput of instructions through a given rename unit. The present invention uses the properties of the particular sequence of instructions to eliminate the redundant allocation of source and destination registers which may increase the number of instructions that can be processed simultaneously without increasing the size or complexity of the rename unit.